COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 0730-08

Bill No.: Truly Agreed To and Finally Passed SS for SCS for HCS for HB 175

Subject: County Officials; Fees; Liens; Property, Real and Personal; Taxation and Revenue

- Property

Type: Original June 7, 2013

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions of law relating to collection of local

government funds.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

Bill No. Truly Agreed To and Finally Passed SS for SCS for HCS for HB 175

Page 2 of 5 June 7, 2013

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0	

- □ Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).
- □ Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Local Government	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

§§ 67.457, 67.463, 67.469, 67.1521, 140.050, 140.115, 140.150, 140.160, 140.230, 140.290, 140.405, 140.460, 140.470 and 140.665 - Collection of Delinquent Property Taxes and Special Assessments

Officials at the **Department of Revenue**, **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**, **Parkway School District** and **St. Louis County** each assume there is no fiscal impact to their organization from this proposal.

In response to a previous version of this proposal, officials at the **Office of Attorney General** assumed that any potential costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources.

In response to a previous version of this proposal, officials at the City of Columbia, Office of State Treasurer, Office of the Secretary of State and the State Tax Commission each assumed there is no fiscal impact to their organization from this proposal.

In response to a previous version of this proposal, officials from the **Boone County Collector** assumed the changes in this proposal will reduce revenue to county general revenue and some programming costs will occur to remove the fees from collection and distribution software. Those amounts are unknown but assumed to be negligible.

In response to similar legislation from 2013 (SB 83), officials at the **St. Louis County Collector** assumed the removal of the purchase certificate fee, based on 2012 sale figures, would result in a minimal loss in revenue to the county.

Oversight assumes a minimal impact less than \$100,000 to local county government funds from the elimination of a fee for certain tax deeds.

In response to a previous version of this proposal, officials at the **Office of Administration** - **Division of Budget and Planning (BAP)** assumed this proposal changes procedures for local government officials and laws regarding property tax collections. This will have no impact on general and total state revenues. However, changes to the fee schedules for county collectors could impact the calculation in Article X, Section 18(e) of the Missouri Constitution.

BAP assumes this proposal should not result in additional costs or savings to BAP.

KB:LR:OD

L.R. No. 0730-08

Bill No. Truly Agreed To and Finally Passed SS for SCS for HCS for HB 175

Page 4 of 5 June 7, 2013

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a previous version of this proposal, officials from the **Department of Insurance**, **Financial Institutions and Professional Registration**, **Department of Transportation** and the **Department of Natural Resources** each assumed the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2014 (10 Mo.)	FY 2015	FY 2016
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government LOCAL FUNDS	FY 2014 (10 Mo.)	FY 2015	FY 2016
<u>Loss</u> - Counties §140.290 Elimination of Tax Deed Fees	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS	(Less than <u>\$100,000)</u>	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than <u>\$100,000)</u>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

§140.290 - Elimination of Tax Deed Fees:

This proposal eliminates specific language authorizing fees of twenty-five and fifty cents that the county collector is authorized to collect when recording a certificate of purchase of land sold at a tax sale. The collector will continue to be authorized to receive the fee necessary to record the certificate of purchase. The proposal eliminates language authorizing a one dollar and fifty cent fee for certain tax deeds.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

KB:LR:OD

L.R. No. 0730-08
Bill No. Truly Agreed To and Finally Passed SS for SCS for HCS for HB 175
Page 5 of 5
June 7, 2013

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Boone County

City of Columbia

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration

Department of Natural Resources

Department of Revenue

Missouri Department of Transportation

Office of Administration -

Division of Budget and Planning

Office of Attorney General

Office of the Secretary of State

Office of State Treasurer

Parkway School District

St. Louis County

State Tax Commission

Ross Strope Acting Director June 7, 2013

Con Alega